Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

"pinched" at the base or distinctly constricted below into a stipe-like base, and in *N. interius* and *N. Nuttallii* not at all constricted below. The two trees I have under observation both have the fruit not at all "pinched" at the base or constricted into a stipe-like here.

Dr. Rydberg and Dr. Nieuwland agree that *N. Nuttallii* has leaflets with tufts of hairs in the axils of the veins, and that *N. Negundo* has leaflets glabrous or nearly so at maturity. The tree I am calling *N. Nuttallii* has these tufts of hairs in the axils of the veins, but the one I take to be *N. interius* has not this character.

Dr. Nieuwland[1] says that in *N. Negundo* the secondary veins and mesophyl of the leaflets are not conspicuous, and the leaves are thin and membranous.[2] The tree I take to be *N. Nuttallii* has the secondary veins and mesophyl of the leaflets conspicuous and the leaflets are thick and very veiny.

According to Dr. Nieuwland[3], *N. Negundo* seems almost totally absent from the Middle West, but I have seen trees I take to be *N. Negundo* in Southern Kansas, Southwestern Missouri and Northern Arkansas. That the preponderance of evidence is in favor of the tree I am calling *N. Nuttallii* being that species, is, that Nuttall was here at Courtney, Missouri at the beginning of the 19th century, and he gives as the range of his *Negundo fraxinifolium*, "Northwestward on the banks of the Missouri to the Mountains." The tree I am calling *N. interius* can not be *N. Negundo* for the reason that it has densely velvety-pubescent twigs, thick rugose leaflets, secondary veins and mesophyl prominent and whitish, fruit not "pinched" at base, wings of fruits scarcely not at all decurrent on fruit body, and leaves frequently bipinnate.

Courtney, Missouri.

Notes on Priority of Plant Names.

BY J. A. NIEUWLAND.

CATHARANTHUS.

It is difficult to see why the new name *Ammocallis*[4] was used for a segregate genus from *Vinca*, when there was at least one valid older one. *Vinca rosea* Linn. was first taken out of the genus and made the type of a new one by Reichenbach[1] under *Lochnera.* There was, however, an older *Lochneria* Scopoli.[2] In 1833 S. Don founded the genus *Catharanthus*[3] with *Vincra rosea* Linn. and *Vinca pusilla* Linn. The former is mentioned first by Don and is therefore to be taken as type should there be any question of ambiguity as to successive segregation.[4]

---

[1] Nieuwland, l. c. p. 136.

[2] Nieuwland, l. c. p. 136.

[3] Nieuwland, l. c. p. 138.

[4] Small, J. K., Fl. SE. U. S. p. 935, (1903) also 2nd Ed. (1913).

Catharanthus S. Don l. c.
"*Vinca species* Linn." l. c.
Lochnera Reichb. l. c. (1828) not *Lochneria* Scopoli (1777) l. c.
Ammocallis Small (1903), (1913) l. c.

Catharanthus roseus G. Don. l. c.
Lochnera rosea Reichb. l. c.
Ammocallis rosea Small l. c. p. 936.
Vinca rosea Linn. Syst. Ed. x. p. 944, (1758).

NEZERA.

Rafinesque's genus *Nezera*[5] is evidently based on the *Linum striatum* of Walter. Dr. Small[6] accepts Reichenbach's[7] later name *Cathartolinum* based on the type *Linum Catharticum* Linn. As long as the two types are retained in the same group segregate, we would expect that the older name be taken up as dictated by the rules of priority. Following is the diagnosis of Rafinesque, given here so that those to whom this author's work is not readily accessible, may use their own judgment as to the practical identity of *Nezera* and *Cathartolinum*, as far as our American species are concerned.

"899 NEZERA Raf. differs from Linum, calix with 5 segments unequal in size or shape, stamens equal to the calix, anthers oblong, styles 5 (p. 65) very long stigmas thick oblong capsule 5 locular.—

---

[1] Reichenbach, H. G. L., Consp. Reg. Veg. p. 134, (1828).

[2] Scopoli, J. A. Introd. p. 271, (1777).

[3] Don. G., Gen. Hist. Dichl. Pl. iv., p. 95, (1838).

[4] The Kew Index gives the date 1836 for Don's work, but volume 4 of the History has 1838 on the title page. The name *Lochnera* Reichb. was taken up by E. Spach, Hist. Nat. Veg. VIII., p. 526, (1 39), having *Vinca rosea* Linn. as type.

[5] Rafinesque, C. S., New. Fl. N. Am. II., p. 64, seg. (1836).

[6] Small, J. K., Fl. S. E. U. S. 2nd ed. p. 662, (1913) also N. Am. Fl. 25, p. 71. Britton N. L., Ill. Fl. II., p. 436, (1913).

[7] Reichenbach, H. G. L., Handb. p. 306, (1837).

Another G. of the family Linidia besides those of my fl. tellur. Habit similar, but the inequality of calix is very striking and generic. The name means *not true flax*, and several sp. of it are perhaps blended in Linum. . . ."

"901 NEZERA ALBIFLORA Raf. Linum *striatum* Walter in Coll. herb. stem virgate simple subangular, leaves linear acuminate adpressed, margin rough, upper subulate, flowers subcorymbose. few, peduncles equal to calix segments ovate acuminate uninerve. petals obovate—Hills of Georgia and Carolina, pedal slender, leaves smaller and not so crowded as in the last, flowers with 3 corymbose branches bearing 2 or 3 flowers, the lateral on short peduncles, calix with unequal segments but of uniform shape, petals white smaller than in the last and narrower obtuse not flabellate. Stem not striate as it ought to be in *L. striatum* of Walter omitted by all our botanists.—I find in a collection of plants made in Texas by Drummond (and sent me by Torrey without names, altho' (p. 66) he says that Hooker has named them in his compendium) two new Flax apparently of this genus which I have designated as follows. . . ."

The *Nezera albiflora* Raf. which he declined to call *Nezera striata* because he failed to find in the dried plant the striations he mentions is therefore considered by him as also the Kew Index as *Linum striatum* Walter, or *Cathartolinum striatum* (Walt.) Small which heads the list of segregates in that author's flora. Other species are *N. virginiana* (L.), *cathartica* (L.), *sulcata* (Redd), *rigida* (Pursh.), etc. Linum do. of the manuals.

ANYCHIASTRUM SMALL, A SYNONYM.

In the New Flora of North America Rafinesque proposed the genus *Buinalis*[1] typified by *B. floridana*. As a synonym he gives "*Herniaria floridana* Bald. do." On the authority of the Index Kewensis this is identified with *Paronychia Baldwinii* (T. & G.) Fenzl,[2] or *Anychia Baldwinii* T. & G.[3] On studying the description of Rafinesque, it would appear that the conclusion of the Kew Index seems unwarranted; for there is a considerable discrepancy between the plant we know as *Paronychia Baldwinii* (T. & G.) Fenzl, or *Anychiastrum Baldwinii* (T. & G.) Small, and the plant Rafinesque must have had in mind when he proposed the genus *Buinalis*, as is evident from the description thereof herewith appended.[1]

---

[1] Rafinesque C. S., New Flora of N. Am. Neobotanon, p. 40, (1836).

[2] Fenzl. in Walp. Rep. 1, p. 262, (1842).

[3] Torrey, J. & Gray, A. Fl. N. Am. 1, p. 172, (1838–40).

Another genus is proposed by the same author, that is

---

[1] As the works of Rafinesque are rare we think it best to reproduce the publication of both *Buinalis and Plagidia.*

Rafinesque, C. S. New Flora and Botany of North America, Philadelphia, (1836), p. 40.

830 BUINALIS Raf. dioical. calix deeply 5 fid persistent, base turbinate with 5 tubercles at the clefts, segments flat edged and crowned by a thick colored membrane. Corolla none, male fl. with 5 stamens perigynous inserted on the calyx short filiform fertile, and 5 alternate sterile without anthers, sometimes lacking. In female fl. ovary ovate, stple filiform elongate stigma simple. Fruit Akena ovate smooth monosperm. *Stem articulate,* leaves opposite sessile entire stipulate, flowers fascicled—a new G. or fam. It differs from my *G. Steiremis* in fl. tellur. by dioical single calix, free stamens, etc. It has the habit of Herniaria and Anychia to which it is also related but differs by dioical flowers and single style, besides the calix not angular not acute, etc. The name was an old latin one of Herniaria.

831 BUINALIS FLORIDANA Raf. Herniaria Americana Coll. herb. Anychia floridana Baldw. do—prostrate diffuse subdichotome fuscate, leaves sessile cuneate or obovate obtuse or sub- (p. 41) acute, entire thickish; flowers sessile terminal in leafy ramulose.—In the sands of Florida, found by Baldwin, perennial, almost suffruticose, stems 3–6 inches long, very ramose, stipules scariose ovate acuminate, leaves small 2–3 times long, quite brown in the dry specimens; flowers minute dark purple margined of white the ends of segments truncate almost retuse forming a vault but not a hood. These flowers are at the ends of the small branches crowded with small leaves and stipules.

834 PLAGIDIA Raf. difference from Anychia, calix conical pentagonal, segments unequal acuminate not hooded, stamens 5 fertile. Style bifid, 2 stigmas acute. . *Annual plants? leaves obliqual broader, flowers in dichotomies.* The name derives from the double obliquity of the leaves. All these genera belong to the AMARANTHIDES. . . .

p. 43. 839 ARGYROCOMA IMBRICATA Raf., etc.

. . . . A third spieces Par. sessiliflora N. but his *P. hernarioides* is probably of next genus.

840 PLAGIDIA RUFA Raf. Anychia hernarioides Mx ? dichotome scabrous, much branched astigiate entirely rufous, leaves obliqual crowded elliptic mucronate ciliolate, stipules lanceolate acuminate, flowers solitary.—Described from a specimen from Florida anonymous in Collins herb. apparently the plant of Mx. but I can't be certain as he omitted the singular obliquity of the leaves almost as in Chamasyke, and the striking rufous color almost like snuff of the whole plant even the stipules, about 3 inches high, leaves 3 lines long, quite obliqual at the base altho's sessile, flowers few and small.

Plagidia.[1] The name as customary at times is suggested as a subgenus if not acceptable as genus, and accordingly not dignified by being put in type quite as large as the other genera in the work. That Rafinesque's mind was primarily to propose a real genus, and not simply a subdivision or subgenus in this particular case is evident from the fact that he further on he names and gives the characters of the types species as *Plagidia rufa* Raf.[2] The author seems to have some doubt as to the identity of this type with the *Anychia hernarioides* Mx., because Michaux omitted one or characters which Rafinesque considers important in his type. Comparison of the characters described under *Plagidia* and *Plagidia rufa* Raf. herewith reproduced with Michaux' *Anychia hernarioides*,[3] latter called *Paronychia hernarioides*, and transferred by Small to his genus *Anychiastrum*, shows that it is identical with Rafinesque's *Plagidia rufa* in every minute respect. Dr. Small has designated as the type of his segregated genus above mentioned, *Paronychia riparia* Chapm.[4] and includes also *Paronychia Baldwinii* (T. & G.) Fenzl. and *Paronychia hernarioides* (Michx.) Nutt. Although Rafinesque's type and Small's type are not the same, it would seem that as long as the two plants are not considered distinctively different enough to be in separate genera, any group containing the two should be given the older name. We therefore transfer the plants under the name *Plagidia* which possesses priority.

Plagidia Raf. l. c. p. 42, (1836), (*Buinalis* Raf.? acc. to deduction on authority of Kew Index) not of *Buinalis* Rafinesque acc. to description.
Anychiastram Small l. c. p. 400, (1903).
Paroynchia Adans. Fam. des Pl. 2, p. 272, (1763) segregate.

Plagidia hernarioides (Michx.) Nwd.
Anychiastrum hernarioides (Michx.) Small, l. c.
Plagidia rufa Raf. l. c. p. 43, (1836). (Rafinesque's type of *Plagidia.*
Paronychia hernarioides (Michx.) Nutt.

Plagidia Baldwinii (T. & G.) Nwd.
(*Buinalis Baldwinii* Kew. Index. not Raf. l. c. p. 43.

---

[1] l. c. p. 42.
[2] l. c. p. 43.
[3] Michaux, A., Fl. Bor. Am. 1, p. 172, (1803).
[4] Chapman Fl. S. U. S. Supp. p. 607, (1860).

Anychiastrum Baldwinii (T. & G.) Small l. c.
Paronychia Baldwinii (T. & G.)

Plagidia riparia (Chapm.) Nwd.
Anychiastrum riparium (Chapm.) Small, l. c. (Small's type of *Anychiastrum*).
Paronychia riparia Chapm.

Plagidia montana (Small) Nwd.
Anychiastrum montanum Small Torreya 101, p. 230, (1910).

VITICELLA

Dr. Small[1] in adopting the name *Viticella* for the segregated genus with *Clematis Viticella* Linn. as a type, did not take the valid name whether 1753 be accepted as the "starting point" for nomenclature, or absolute historical priority admitted. The name seems to have been used for that plant as type of a new genus by Dillenius in his treatise, Nova Plantarum Genera p. 165, (1719). Neither the first[2] nor the second[3] edition of his Hortus Elthamensis have any record of *Viticella*, most likely because the plant was not found in the Eltham Gardens, and the first publication since 1753 of this *Clematis* segregate is that of Moench[4] to whom the genus should be attributed by the followers of the American and Vienna Codes. Before Linnaeus *Viticella* was used by Caesalpinus for *Clematis Flammula* Linn., by Matthaeus Sylvaticus for *Bryonia alba*, and before the time of Dodonaeus for a cucurbitaceous plant by some. The name is not a most desirable one at that in a good system of nomenclature, being a misnomer, and objectionable in the Linnaean as a diminutive form of the existing name *Vitex*. This *Viticella* as used since 1753 is, moreover, antedated by another *Viticella* Mitchell[5], (1769) the identity of which has been variously interpreted by a number of authors, to be shown further on. Whatever, Mitchell's name be applied to or whether not with absolute certainty applied to any known plant heretofore, there can be no question that Moench's later application must be displaced by another even if a new one must be made. The next name in order for the *Clematis* segregate is perhaps *Sieboldia* Hoffing.[1] Of this genus *Clematis florida* Thunb. or *Clematis japonica* Thunb. should be type. Spach[2] who admits Moench's *Viticella* puts the former of these in that genus as *Viticella florida* DC so for this reason was *Sieboldia* Hoffing suggested here. *Sieboldia Viticella* (Linn.) or *Clematis Viticella* Linn., may therefore be put in this genus unless the type were the other plant *Clematis japonica* Thunb. or *Sieboldia japonica* (Thunb.) Hoffmg. In the latter case *Sieboldia* would be but an unconditional synonym perhaps of *Clematis* itself.[3]

---

[1] Small, J. K. Fl. S. E. U. S. (1903) p. 437.

[2] Dillen, J. Hort. Eltham. (1732).

[3] Dillen, J. Hort. Eltham. (1774).

[4] Moench, C. Meth. Plant. p. 296, (1794).

[5] Mitchell, Dr. J. Dissertatio Brevis de Prin. Botan. & Zool., cum Append. aliquot. Gen. Pl. recens cond. and in Virginia Obs. Norimbergae, impensis Wolfgangi Schwarz-Kopfii (1769), 4, 46. p. (See Pritzel 1st and 2nd editions also Kuntze, O. Rev. Gen. Pl. I, p. 519, (1893). The first edition of Mitchell's work came out in Act. Ac. Carol. 8, or Ephem. Norimb. (1748). This was, however, by the author given as follows, "Dabam ex aedibus meis Virginiae 11, 3, (1741).

As to the identity of *Viticella* Mitchell (1748 and 1769) more than one suggestion has been made. Brand[4] apparently unmindful that Mitchell's treatise of 1748 was also republished in 1769, and apparently on the authority of Asa Gray[5], states that it was meant for *Hydrophyllum appendiculatum* Linn. The Index Kewensis also maintained this supposed equivalence. Brand fails to explain why *Viticella* Mitchell (1769) was not taken up by him for the much later *Decemium* Raf.[6] (1817), unless he was unaware of the 1769 edition of Mitchell, or unless he saw that the *description* of Mitchell was but very questionably applicable to *Hydrophyllym appendiculatum* Linn. Comparison even superficial, of the character of this plant with Mitchell's publication of *Viticella* shows that the description not only varies much but is in many respects indeed contradictory and quite inapplicable.

Adanson[7] in reference of course to the publication in the first edition of Mitchell's work, and likewise Boehmer[8] consider

---

[1] Hoffmannsegg, J. C. Preisv. Nachtr. p. 28, (1842).

[2] Spach, E. Hist. Nat. Veg. 7, p. 264, (1839).

[3] As I have been unable to study Hoffmannsegg's work it may be that, the other plant be the type, and in case the genus *Sieboldia* be inapplicable I suggest the name *Atrichlema* to replace *Viticella* (Dill) Moench.

[4] Brand, A. Das Pflanzenreich IV, 251, p. 36, (1913).

[5] "*Teste A. Gray*" l. c.

[6] Rafinesque, C. S. Fl. Ludov. p. 34, (1817) in obs.

[7] Adanson, M. Fam. des Pl. 2, pp. 226, 560, 619, (1763).

[8] Boehmer, G. R. in Ludwig-Boehmer, Def. Gen. Pl. p. 27, (1760).

his *Viticella* equivalent to *Galax* Linnaeus; this probably becuase Linnaeus[1] himself mistakenly mentions this name in synonymy with his *Galax*. Spach[2] too, accepts the same opinion, all having overlooked the fact that the description of Mitchell is not at all applicable. His description can in no way be applied to the Linnaean *Galax*, the latter having only two to four segments on the calyx, while Mitchell's plant had five small lanceolate reflexed, alternating, shorter segments." More than likely it was because of these and other misrepresentations, and injustices that Mitchell's work was deemed necessary for republication in 1769, this edition being considered a protest against the disregard of Linnaeus of his first publication. Little heed was paid, however, to this latter edition, or still is, for that matter, as regards, for example, credit for publication of *Aphyllon*, *Pentstemon* and *Viticella*.

As may be readily seen by those who compare the description of Mitchell's *Viticella* here given,[3] with *Galax*, or *Hydrophyllum appendiculatum*, the discrepancies are too great to favor the views of those authors already referred to. It seems, however, on studying and comparing this description that it applies very accurately to a plant then unrecorded apparently, but which in fact Mitchell may have had both at hand and in mind, when he published *Viticella* in the list of genera omitted by Linnaeus in the edition of the Genera Plantarum of 1737 to which it was proposed as supplement by its author. I refer to the plant called by Nuttall later, *Ellisia microcalyx*,[4] now called *Nemophila microcalyx* (Nutt.)

---

[1] Linnaeus; C., Sp. Pl. p. 200 (1753), p. 289 (1763).

[2] Spach, E. Hist. Nat. Veg. 9, p. 444 (1840).

[3] Following is the text of Mitchell's description, p. 42, l. c.

XXIV. VITICELLA, *Cal. perianthium* decaphyllum, foliolis alternis, externis brevioribus, lanceolatis, reflexis; internis longioribus lanceolatis acutis erectis.

Cor. monopetala hypocrateriformis, tubus cylindricus calyce ferme brevior; limbus planus, quinquefidus laciniis obtusiis.

Stam. filamenta quinque parva, brevia, corolla adnata, *Antherae* subrotundae in collo corollae conniventes.

Pist. germen ovatum villosum. *Stylus* filiformis, semibifidus, longitudine staminum. *Stigma* subrotunda.

Per. capsula ovata, unilocularis, (bivalvis membranacea, colorata) vi elastica praedita.

Sem. duo, magna, plano-concava, ovata, dura, callosa; quasi unicum bilobum.

[4] Nuttall, T. Trans. Am. Phil. Soc. N. Ser. V, p. 191 (1833 or 1837).

Fisch & May,[1] and called by Muhlenberg *Hydrophyllum pusillum* according to Nuttall. This plant is reported from Virginia on the authority of Gray.[2] The name *Viticella* would then seem an older and valid one for the genus *Nemophila* Nuttall[3] as typified in this case by *N.* or *V. microcalyx.* The name would then supplant *Nemophila* which it antedates by more than fifty years.

TRIORCHOS.

The name *Triorchos* Small and Nash[4] is so much like *Triorchis* Petiver-Millan[5] both in sound and even ultimate derivation that it becomes a homonym. I suggest that **Smallia** take its place.

Dept. of Botany,
Notre Dame, Ind.

Our Birds in the Winter of 1912-13.

BY BROTHER ALPHONSUS, C. S. C.

In December, the temperature remained above freezing point until the 7th, but after that date it was generally below 32°. The records in this article begin on the above date. Throughout the winter there were days when the weather was exceedingly mild, a fact that would account for the presence of certain species that I had not observed before in any winter. Such were the Northern Shrike and Herring Gull. In March, the weather was cold up to the 8th, when the temperature rose to 38°; and the next day the first Robins appeared. This date marked the end of winter.

In December, the Blue Jay was present on 10 days, with the longest interval of 11 days. In January, it was seen on 15 days, with the short interval of 2 days. In February, it was observed on 9 days, the longest interval being 5 days. In March, there were but two records, with an interval of 6 days.

---

[1] Fisch and Mey. Sert. Petropol. t. 8, (1846).

[2] Gray, A. Man. Bot. N. U. S. p. 327 (1858. "*Rich moist woods* Virginia near Washington) and southward.

[3] Nuttall, T. Jr. Phil. Acad. 2, p. 179 (1822).

[4] Small, J. K. Fl. S. E. U. S. p. 329 (1903).

[5] Petiver-Millan Op. Hist. Nat. Spect. II. (1764) Gazophyllacium, t. 68, 7. See Am. Mid. Nat. III. p. 122, (1913).